

7

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Office Action dated September 30, 2005. Applicants have amended Claims 1, 9 and 16 to more clearly point out the present inventive concept. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Claims 16-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Bacon*, U.S. Patent No. 6,307,538. This rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to the amended claims.

The *Bacon* reference teaches the inclusion of a transducer and a microcontroller into a housing with additional other devices/chips. The transducer is operable to provide a differential input signal on lines (88) and (90) and then input these to the microcontroller core (102) through a transducer. A serial interface engine is then operable to convert this data from the microcontroller to serial data for transmission to a computer. There is also provided a positive and a negative voltage input for interfacing therewith to provide power to the microcontroller. However, Claim 16 sets forth that this is a single chip processor that interfaces with the first data protocol and the second data protocol, both being serial data protocols. Therefore, there is no separate serial interface engine required. All of the functionality can be provided on a single chip that is powered by the first physical interface with the first serial data communication interface. Thus, Applicants believe that *Bacon* does not anticipate or obviate Applicants' present inventive concept, as *Bacon* requires basically a processor core, a multiplexer and a serial data interface engine, in addition to an isolator, all of which are required to interface between the serial interface of the computer and the transducer. Further, the housing also includes the transducer and all the associated information and functionality associated therewith. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection with respect to Claims 16-25.

With respect to Claim 21, Claim 21 indicates that both serial data interfaces are different. There is no description in *Bacon* to indicate that the two serial interfaces are different. Thus, Applicants believe that *Bacon* is insufficient to support a rejection of Claim 21.

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE

S/N 10/625,580

Atty. Dkt. No. CYGL-26,370

8

Claims 1-15 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bacon* in view of *Ware et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,446,696. This rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to the amended claims.

The *Ware* reference provides nothing more than an oscillator disposed on a processor chip. There is no discussion as to whether this is actually free running or crystal based; rather, the specification is silent with respect thereto. Even so, an oscillator on a chip is insufficient to support a rejection of a free running oscillator that provides a time base for the operation of the processor, which is utilized to interface with the serial data protocols. Thus, Applicants believe that the combination of *Ware* and *Bacon* do not anticipate or obviate Applicants' present inventive concept, as defined by the amended claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection with respect to Claims 1-15 and 30.

Applicants have now made an earnest attempt in order to place this case in condition for allowance. For the reasons stated above, Applicant s respectfully request full allowance of the claims as amended. Please charge any additional fees or deficiencies in fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-0780/CYGL-26,370 of HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,
HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants


Gregory M. Howison³
Registration No. 30,646

GMH:keb
P.O. Box 741715
Dallas, Texas 75374-1715
Tel: 972-479-0462
Fax: 972-479-0464
March 30, 2006

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE
S/N 10/625,580
Atty. Dkt. No. CYGL-26,370